arXiv:hep-ph/9904210v4 26 Aug 1999

hep-ph/9904210

Atmospheric and Solar Neutrinos from Single Right-Handed Neutrino Dominance and $U(1)$ Family Symmetry

S. F. King

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, U.K.

Abstract

We discuss a natural explanation of both neutrino mass hierarchies *and* large neutrino mixing angles, as required by the atmospheric neutrino data, in terms of a single right-handed neutrino giving the dominant contribution to the 23 block of the light effective neutrino matrix, and illustrate this mechanism in the framework of models with $U(1)$ family symmetries. Sub-dominant contributions from other right-handed neutrinos are required to give small mass splittings appropriate to the small angle MSW solution to the solar neutrino problem. We give general conditions for achieving this in the framework of $U(1)$ family symmetry models containing arbitrary numbers of right-handed neutrinos, and show how the resulting neutrino mass hierarchies and mixing angles may be expanded in terms of the Wolfenstein parameter.

1 Introduction

There is now strong evidence for atmospheric neutrino oscillations [1], [2] which confirms the earlier indications of the effect [3]. The most recent analyses of Super-Kamiokande [1] involve the hypothesis of $\nu_\mu \to \nu_\tau$ oscillations with maximal mixing $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} = 1$ and a mass splitting of $\Delta m^2_{23} = 2.2 \times 10^{-3}\ eV^2$. Using all their data sets analysed in different ways they quote $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} > 0.82$ and a mass splitting of $5 \times 10^{-4}\ eV^2 < \Delta m^2_{23} < 6 \times 10^{-3}\ eV^2$ at 90% confidence level.

The evidence for solar neutrino oscillations is almost as strong [4]. There are a panoply of experiments looking at different energy ranges, and the best fit to all of them has been narrowed down to two basic scenarios corresponding to either resonant oscillations $\nu_e \to \nu_0$ (where for example ν_0 may be a linear combination of ν_μ, ν_τ) inside the Sun (MSW [5]) or "just-so" oscillations in the vacuum between the Sun and the Earth [6, 7]. There are three MSW fits and one vacuum oscillation fit:

(i) the small angle MSW solution is $\sin^2 2\theta_{12} \approx 5 \times 10^{-3}$ and $\Delta m^2_{12} \approx 5 \times 10^{-6}\ eV^2$;

(ii) the large angle MSW solution is $\sin^2 2\theta_{12} \approx 0.76$ and $\Delta m^2_{12} \approx 1.8 \times 10^{-5}\ eV^2$;

(iii) an additional MSW large angle solution exists with a lower probability [8];

(iv) The vacuum oscillation solution is $\sin^2 2\theta_{12} \approx 0.75$ and $\Delta m^2_{12} \approx 6.5 \times 10^{-11}\ eV^2$ [8].

The standard model has zero neutrino masses, so any indication of neutrino mass is very exciting since it represents new physics beyond the standard model. In this paper we shall assume the see-saw mechanism and no light sterile neutrinos. The see-saw mechanism [9] implies that the three light neutrino masses arise from some heavy "right-handed neutrinos" N_R^p (in general there can be Z gauge singlets with $p = 1, \ldots Z$) with a $Z \times Z$ Majorana mass matrix M_{RR}^{pq} whose entries take values at or below the unification scale $M_U \sim 10^{16}$ GeV. The presence of electroweak scale Dirac mass terms m_{LR}^{ip} (a $3 \times Z$ matrix) connecting the left-handed neutrinos ν_L^i ($i = 1, \ldots 3$) to the right-handed neutrinos N_R^p then results in a very light see-saw suppressed effective 3×3 Majorana mass matrix

$$m_{LL} = m_{LR} M_{RR}^{-1} m_{LR}^T \tag{1}$$

for the left-handed neutrinos ν_L^i, which are the light physical degrees of freedom observed by experiment.

Not surprisingly, following the recent data, there has been a torrent of theoretical papers concerned with understanding how to extend the standard model in order to accomodate the atmospheric and solar neutrino data [10]. Perhaps the minimal extension of the standard model capable of accounting for the atmospheric neutrino data involves the addition of a *single* right-handed neutrino N_R [11, 12]. This is a special case of the general see-saw model with $Z = 1$, so that M_{RR} is a trivial 1×1 matrix and m_{LR} is a 3×1 column matrix where $m_{LR}^T = (\lambda_{\nu_e}, \lambda_{\nu_\mu}, \lambda_{\nu_\tau}) v_2$ with v_2 the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs field H_2 which is responsible for the neutrino Dirac masses, and the notation for the Yukawa couplings λ_i indicates that we are in the charged lepton mass eigenstate basis e_L, μ_L, τ_L with corresponding neutrinos $\nu_{e_L}, \nu_{\mu_L}, \nu_{\tau_L}$. Since M_{RR} is trivially invertible the light effective mass matrix in Eq.1 in the $\nu_{e_L}, \nu_{\mu_L}, \nu_{\tau_L}$ basis is simply given by

$$m_{LL} = \frac{m_{LR} m_{LR}^T}{M_{RR}} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{\nu_e}^2 & \lambda_{\nu_e}\lambda_{\nu_\mu} & \lambda_{\nu_e}\lambda_{\nu_\tau} \\ \lambda_{\nu_e}\lambda_{\nu_\mu} & \lambda_{\nu_\mu}^2 & \lambda_{\nu_\mu}\lambda_{\nu_\tau} \\ \lambda_{\nu_e}\lambda_{\nu_\tau} & \lambda_{\nu_\mu}\lambda_{\nu_\tau} & \lambda_{\nu_\tau}^2 \end{pmatrix} \frac{v_2^2}{M_{RR}}. \tag{2}$$

The matrix in Eq.2 has vanishing determinant which implies a zero eigenvalue. Furthermore the submatrix in the 23 sector has zero determinant which implies a second zero eigenvalue associated with this sector. In order to account for the Super-Kamiokande data we assumed [11]:

$$\lambda_{\nu_e} \ll \lambda_{\nu_\mu} \approx \lambda_{\nu_\tau}. \tag{3}$$

In the $\lambda_{\nu_e} = 0$ limit the matrix in Eq.2 has zeros along the first row and column, and so clearly ν_e is massless, and the other two eigenvectors are simply

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_0 \\ \nu_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{23} & -s_{23} \\ s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

where $t_{23} = \lambda_{\nu_\mu}/\lambda_{\nu_\tau}$, with ν_0 being massless, due to the vanishing of the determinant of the 23 submatrix and ν_3 having a mass $m_{\nu_3} = (\lambda_{\nu_\mu}^2 + \lambda_{\nu_\tau}^2)v_2^2/M_{RR}$. The Super-Kamiokande data is accounted for by choosing the parameters such that $t_{23} \sim 1$ and $m_{\nu_3} \sim 5 \times 10^{-2}$ eV. In this approximation the atmospheric neutrino data is then consistent with $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ oscillations via two state mixing, between ν_3 and ν_0. Note how the single right-handed neutrino coupling to the 23 sector implies vanishing determinant of the 23 submatrix. This provides a natural explanation of both large 23 mixing angles and a hierarchy of neutrino masses in the 23 sector at the same time [11].

In order to account for the solar neutrino data a small mass perturbation is required to lift the massless degeneracy of the two neutrinos ν_0, ν_e. In our original approach [11] [1] we introduced additional right-handed neutrinos in order to provide a subdominant contribution to the effective mass matrix in Eq.2. To be precise we assumed a single dominant right-handed neutrino below the unification scale, with additional right-handed neutrinos at the unification scale which lead to subdominant contributions to the effective neutrino mass matrix. By appealing to quark and lepton mass hierarchy we assumed that the additional subdominant right-handed neutrinos generate a contribution $m_{\nu_\tau} \approx m_t^2/M_U \approx 2\times 10^{-3}$ eV, where m_t is the top quark mass. The effect of this is to give a mass perturbation to the 33 component of the mass matrix in Eq.2, which results in ν_0 picking up a small mass, through its ν_τ component, while ν_e remains massless. Solar neutrino oscillations then arise from $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_0$ with the mass splitting in the right range for the small angle MSW solution, controlled by a small mixing angle $\theta_{12} \approx \lambda_{\nu_e}/\sqrt{\lambda_{\nu_\mu}^2 + \lambda_{\nu_\tau}^2}$. The main prediction of this scheme is of the neutrino oscillation $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_3$ with a mass difference $\Delta m_{13}^2 \approx \Delta m_{23}^2$ determined by the Super-Kamiokande data and a mixing angle $\theta_{13} \approx \theta_{12}$ determined by the small angle MSW solution. Such oscillations may be observable at the proposed long baseline experiments via $\nu_3 \rightarrow \nu_e$ which implies $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ oscillations with $\sin^2 2\theta \approx 5 \times 10^{-3}$ (the small MSW angle) and $\Delta m^2 \approx 2.2 \times 10^{-3}\ eV^2$ (the Super-Kamiokande square mass difference).

---

[1] Another approach [12] which does not rely on additional right-handed neutrinos is to use SUSY radiative corrections so that the one-loop corrected neutrino masses are not zero but of order 10^{-5} eV suitable for the vacuum oscillation solution.

It should be clear from the foregoing discussion that the motivation for single right-handed neutrino dominance (SRHND) is that the determinant of the 23 submatrix of Eq.2 approximately vanishes, leading to a natural explanation of *both* large neutrino mixing angles *and* hierarchical neutrino masses in the 23 sector *at the same time* [11]. Although the explicit example of SRHND above was based on one of the right-handed neutrinos being lighter than the others, it is clear that the idea of SRHND is more general than this. In the present paper we shall define SRHND more generally as the requirement that a single right-handed neutrino gives the dominant contribution to the 23 submatrix of the light effective neutrino mass matrix. We shall propose SRHND as a general requirement and address the following two questions:

1. What are the general conditions under which SRHND in the 23 block can arise and how can we quantify the contribution of the sub-dominant right-handed neutrinos which are responsible for breaking the massless degeneracy, and allowing the small angle MSW solution?
2. How can we understand the pattern of neutrino Yukawa couplings in Eq.3 where the assumed equality $\lambda_{\nu_\mu} \approx \lambda_{\nu_\tau}$ is apparently at odds with the hierarchical Yukawa couplings in the quark and charged lepton sector?

In order to address the two questions above we shall discuss SRHND in the context of a $U(1)$ family symmetry. In fact neutrino masses and mixing angles have already been studied in the context of $U(1)$ family symmetry models but in the models that exist to date either SRHND is not present at all [13], [14], or where it is present its presence has apparently gone unnoticed [15]. [2] Where there is no SRHND, either the contribution to the 23 mixing angles coming from the neutrino matrix are small [13], or the 23 neutrino mass hierarchy is not described by the Wolfenstein expansion parameter [14]. Where the 23 neutrino mass hierarchies are described by the Wolfenstein expansion parameter *and* large 23 mixing angles naturally arise [15], we shall show that the physical reason why these models are successful is that a single right-handed neutrino is giving the dominant contribution to the 23 submatrix of m_{LL}. We shall give general conditions that theories with $U(1)$ family symmetry must satisfy in order to have SRHND and show that the models in [15] satisfy these conditions.

2 MSSM with Z Right-handed Neutrinos

To fix the notation, we assume the Yukawa terms of the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) augmented by Z right-handed neutrinos,

$$\mathcal{L}_{yuk} = \epsilon_{ab}\left[-Y^u_{ij}H^a_uQ^b_iU^c_j + Y^d_{ij}H^a_dQ^b_iD^c_j + Y^e_{ij}H^a_dL^b_iE^c_j - Y^\nu_{ip}H^a_uL^b_iN^c_p + \frac{1}{2}M^{pq}_{RR}N^c_pN^c_q\right] + H.c. \tag{5}$$

where $\epsilon_{ab} = -\epsilon_{ba}$, $\epsilon_{12} = 1$, and the remaining notation is standard except that the Z right-handed neutrinos N^p_R have been replaced by their CP conjugates N^c_p with $p, q = 1, \ldots, Z$. When the two Higgs doublets get their vacuum expectation values

---

[2] We should point out that the condition of the approximately vanishing subdeterminant was first clearly stated in ref.[15]. However all the actual examples presented there correspond to a single right-handed neutrino giving the dominant contribution to the 23 block of the effective neutrino mass matrix, which is essentially the mechanism first proposed in ref.[11]. Also note that SRHND has very recently been applied to an $SU(2)$ family symmetry model[16].

(VEVS) $< H_u^2 >= v_2$, $< H_d^1 >= v_1$ with $\tan\beta \equiv v_2/v_1$ we find the terms

$$\mathcal{L}_{yuk} = v_2 Y_{ij}^u U_i U_j^c + v_1 Y_{ij}^d D_i D_j^c + v_1 Y_{ij}^e E_i E_j^c + v_2 Y_{ip}^\nu N_i N_p^c + \frac{1}{2} M_{RR}^{pq} N_p^c N_q^c + H.c. \quad (6)$$

Replacing CP conjugate fields we can write in a matrix notation

$$\mathcal{L}_{yuk} = \bar{U}_L v_2 Y^u U_R + \bar{D}_L v_1 Y^d D_R + \bar{E}_L v_1 Y^e E_R + \bar{N}_L v_2 Y^\nu N_R + \frac{1}{2} N_R^T M_{RR} N_R + H.c. \quad (7)$$

where we have assumed that all the masses and Yukawa couplings are real and written $Y^\star = Y$. The diagonal mass matrices are given by the following unitary transformations

$$\begin{aligned} v_2 Y_{diag}^u &= V_{uL} v_2 Y^u V_{uR}^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{m_u}, \mathrm{m_c}, \mathrm{m_t}), \\ v_1 Y_{diag}^d &= V_{dL} v_1 Y^d V_{dR}^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{m_d}, \mathrm{m_s}, \mathrm{m_b}), \\ v_1 Y_{diag}^e &= V_{eL} v_1 Y^e V_{eR}^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{m_e}, \mathrm{m_\mu}, \mathrm{m_\tau}), \\ M_{RR}^{diag} &= \Omega_{RR} M_{RR} \Omega_{RR}^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{M_{R1}}, \ldots, \mathrm{M_{RZ}}), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the unitary transformations are also orthogonal. From Eq.1 the light effective left-handed Majorana neutrino mass matrix is

$$m_{LL} = v_2^2 Y_\nu M_{RR}^{-1} Y_\nu^T \quad (9)$$

Having constructed the light Majorana mass matrix it must then be diagonalised by unitary transformations,

$$m_{LL}^{diag} = V_{\nu L} m_{LL} V_{\nu L}^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{m_{\nu_1}}, \mathrm{m_{\nu_2}}, \mathrm{m_{\nu_3}}). \quad (10)$$

The CKM matrix is given by

$$V_{CKM} = V_{uL} V_{dL}^\dagger \quad (11)$$

and its leptonic analogue is the MNS matrix [17]

$$V_{MNS} = V_{\nu L} V_{eL}^\dagger. \quad (12)$$

3 Wolfenstein Expansions

The Wolfenstein parametrisation of the CKM matrix yields the approximate form [18]:

$$V_{CKM} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{13}$$

where $\lambda \approx V_{us} \approx 0.22$. The horizontal quark and lepton mass ratios may similarly be expanded in terms of the Wolfenstein parameter: [3]

$$\frac{m_u}{m_t} \sim \lambda^8, \quad \frac{m_c}{m_t} \sim \lambda^4, \quad \frac{m_d}{m_b} \sim \lambda^4, \quad \frac{m_s}{m_b} \sim \lambda^2, \quad \frac{m_e}{m_\tau} \sim \lambda^4, \quad \frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau} \sim \lambda^2. \tag{14}$$

Assuming the MSSM the vertical quark and lepton mass ratios at M_U are

$$\frac{m_b}{m_t} \sim \lambda^3, \quad \frac{m_b}{m_\tau} \sim 1. \tag{15}$$

Assuming that $V_{CKM} \sim V_{uL} \sim V_{dL}$, and the diagonal elements of the Yukawa matrices are of the same order as the eigenvalues:[4]

$$Y^u \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^8 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^3 \\ - & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ - & - & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y^d \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^3 & \lambda^3 \\ - & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ - & - & 1 \end{pmatrix} \lambda^n \tag{16}$$

where $\tan\beta \sim \lambda^{n-3}$. Note that the CKM matrix only gives information about the upper triangular parts of the quark Yukawa matrices.

The MNS matrix is less well determined, but Super-Kamiokande tells us that $\theta_{23} \sim 1$ and the small angle MSW solution implies $\theta_{12} \sim \lambda^2$. In addition for $\Delta m^2 > 9 \times 10^{-4}\ eV^2$ (i.e. over most of the atmospheric range) CHOOZ [19] fails to observe $\nu_e \to \nu_3$ and excludes $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} > 0.18$ or $\theta_{13} > 0.22$. Hence CHOOZ allows $\theta_{13} \leq \lambda^2$. If we assume for the sake of argument that $\theta_{13} \sim \lambda^2$ (recall that this is a prediction of SRHND which follows from Eqs.2 and 3) then V_{MNS} is given by:

$$V_{MNS} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{17}$$

---

[3] We follow the expansions in ref.[14] even though $\frac{m_e}{m_\tau} \sim \lambda^5$ is a better fit.

[4] Again this is similar to ref.[14] except that we allow a more general $\tan\beta$ dependence

Then, in a similar way to the quarks, assuming that $V_{MNS} \sim V_{\nu L} \sim V_{eL}$, and the diagonal elements of the charged lepton matrix are of the same order as the eigenvalues we deduce

$$Y^e \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ - & \lambda^2 & 1 \\ - & - & 1 \end{pmatrix} \lambda^n. \tag{18}$$

The same argument applied to m_{LL} runs into trouble because the hierarchy between the second and third eigenvalues is apparently not consistent with $\theta_{23} \sim 1$. To be precise Super-Kamiokande tells us that $m_{\nu_3} \approx 5 \times 10^{-2}$ eV, and small angle MSW tells us that $m_{\nu_2} \approx 2 \times 10^{-3}$ eV, hence

$$\frac{m_{\nu_2}}{m_{\nu_3}} \sim \lambda^2. \tag{19}$$

The problem is how to generate such a hierarchy in the presence of large neutrino mixing angles. Note that this problem can be avoided for the charged lepton matrix in Eq.18 due to the undetermined 32 element which can be small, but for the symmetric neutrino matrix it is a problem. Fortunately the solution is provided by SRHND which implies that m_{LL} is given from Eqs.2 and 3 as:

$$m_{LL} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} m_{\nu_3} \tag{20}$$

It is clear that SRHND leads to the prediction

$$\frac{m_{\nu_1}}{m_{\nu_3}} \sim \lambda^4, \tag{21}$$

in addition to the previously mentioned prediction $\theta_{13} \sim \lambda^2$. The key to obtaining the hierarchy in Eq.19 from Eq.20 is the requirement that the determinant of the 23 submatrix must vanish to order λ^2. Since this subdeterminant naturally vanishes for a single right-handed neutrino coupling to the 23 sector, as in Eq.2, all that is required is for the subdominant right-handed neutrino to generate a perturbation to the masses in the 23 sector which are of order λ^2 smaller than the leading contribution. We shall now discuss how this can come about in the framework of theories with broken $U(1)$ family symmetry.

4 U(1) Family Symmetry

The idea of accounting for the fermion mass spectrum via a broken family symmetry has a long history [20], [21]. For definiteness we shall focus on a particular class of model based on a single pseudo-anomalous $U(1)_X$ gauged family symmetry [22]. We assume that the $U(1)_X$ is broken by the equal VEVs of two MSSM singlets $\theta, \bar{\theta}$ which have vector-like charges ± 1 [22]. Theories in which the $U(1)_X$ is broken by a chiral MSSM singlet χ which has charge of one sign only, say $+1$, have also been proposed [23], [24]. In all these cases the $U(1)_X$ has anomalies in the effective low energy theory below M_U but these are compensated by string theory effects at M_U and the Green-Schwartz mechanism [25] provides a dimension-five interaction term, whose structure demands a specific pattern among the anomaly coefficients [22]:

$$A(SU(3)_c^2 U(1)_X) : A(SU(2)_L^2 U(1)_X) : A(U(1)_Y^2 U(1)_X) = 1 : 1 : 5/3 \tag{22}$$

The $U(1)_X$ breaking scale is set by $< \theta > = < \bar{\theta} >$ where the VEVs arise from a Green-Schwartz computable Fayet-Illiopoulos D-term which determines these VEVs to be one or two orders of magnitude below M_U. Additional exotic matter which exists in vector-like pairs with opposite charges $\pm X_i$ at a heavy mass scale M_V (generated by the VEVs of yet more singlets) allows the Wolfenstein parameter to be generated by the ratio [22]

$$\frac{< \theta >}{M_V} = \frac{< \bar{\theta} >}{M_V} = \lambda \approx 0.22 \tag{23}$$

The idea is that at tree-level the $U(1)_X$ family symmetry only permits third family Yukawa couplings (e.g. the top quark Yukawa coupling). Smaller Yukawa couplings are generated effectively from higher dimension non-renormalisable operators corresponding to insertions of θ and $\bar{\theta}$ fields and hence to powers of the expansion parameter in Eq.23, which we have identified with the Wolfenstein parameter. The number of powers of the expansion parameter is controlled by the $U(1)_X$ charge of the particular

MSSM operator. [5]

The MSSM fields Q_i, U^c_j, D^c_j, L_i, E^c_j, H_u, H_d are assigned $U(1)_X$ charges q_i, u_j, d_j, l_i, e_j, h_u, h_d consistent with Eq.22. This restricts the physical values of the charges which we are permitted to assign. [6] We do not impose any restriction on the Z right-handed MSSM singlet neutrinos N^c_p which therefore have unconstrained charges n_p. We shall suppose that the right-handed neutrino Majorana mass matrix M_{RR} arises from the VEV of another MSSM singlet Σ with charge σ [13]. The anomaly restriction means that there must exist a physical basis where the Higgs charges are equal and opposite, $h_u = -h_d$ in order to cancel their contributions to the anomalies, and gives a zero charge to the $\mu H_u H_d$ term. The other operators in Eq.5 will in general have non-zero charges and from Eqs.23, the associated Yukawa couplings and Majorana mass terms may then be expanded in powers of the Wolfenstein parameter,

$$Y^u_{ij} \sim \lambda^{|q_i+u_j+h_u|}, \quad Y^d_{ij} \sim \lambda^{|q_i+d_j+h_d|}, \quad Y^e_{ij} \sim \lambda^{|l_i+e_j+h_d|}, \tag{24}$$

$$Y^\nu_{ip} \sim \lambda^{|l_i+n_p+h_u|}, \quad M^{pq}_{RR} \sim \lambda^{|n_p+n_q+\sigma|} < \Sigma > . \tag{25}$$

In the physical basis of charges discussed so far the quarks and leptons must contribute to the anomalies in the ratios in Eq.22. A corollary of this is that the physical charges are related to traceless charges (denoted by primes) by two flavour-independent $SU(5)$ shifts $\Delta t \equiv \Delta q = \Delta u = \Delta e$ and $\Delta f \equiv \Delta l = \Delta d$ [22]:

$$q'_i = q_i + \Delta t, \quad u'_i = u_i + \Delta t, \quad e'_i = e_i + \Delta t, \quad l'_i = l_i + \Delta f, \quad d'_i = d_i + \Delta f, \tag{26}$$

---

[5] Of course this simple picture may in reality be more complicated if several different vector mass scales are assumed, and taking into account the order one dimensionless couplings involving different θ and $\bar{\theta}$ fields coupling the MSSM fields to the heavy vector matter. By making various dynamical assumptions it is possible to generate several different expansion parameters which may be in expanded non-integer powers [13]. It is also possible to introduce several $U(1)$ symmetries, such as a model recently proposed based on a family-independent pseudo-anomalous $U(1)_X$ symmetry together with two further anomaly-free but family-dependent $U(1)$ symmetries [14]. For our purposes here it is sufficient to assume a single $U(1)_X$ family symmetry with the single Wolfenstein expansion parameter in Eq.23 raised to integer powers.

[6] This restriction may be relaxed by assuming that the heavy vector matter has X_i charges chosen to cancel the anomalies, but we prefer instead to regard this as a welcome constraint on the charges. We shall, however, allow heavy MSSM singlets with arbitrary charges to cancel $U(1)^3_X$ anomalies.

It is possible to absorb the $SU(5)$ shifts into the Higgs charges by defining

$$h'_u \equiv h_u - 2\Delta t, \quad h'_d \equiv h_d - \Delta t - \Delta f, \tag{27}$$

so that

$$q_i + u_j + h_u = q'_i + u'_j + h'_u, \quad q_i + d_j + h_d = q'_i + d'_j + h'_d, \quad l_i + e_j + h_d = l'_i + e'_j + h'_d. \tag{28}$$

The couplings in Eq.24 may then be equivalently expanded in terms of primed charges. Tracelessness implies that the first family charges may be eliminated

$$q'_1 = -q'_2 - q'_3, \quad u'_1 = -u'_2 - u'_3, \quad d'_1 = -d'_2 - d'_3, \quad l'_1 = -l'_2 - l'_3, \quad e'_1 = -e'_2 - e'_3. \tag{29}$$

Since the 33 component of the Yukawa matrices are either renormalisable or related to $\tan\beta$ dependent integers we can eliminate the primed Higgs charges using

$$h'_u = -q'_3 - u'_3, \quad h'_d = n_d - q'_3 - d'_3 = n_e - l'_3 - e'_3. \tag{30}$$

Using Eqs.28, 29, 30 the Yukawa matrices in 24 may then be expressed as

$$Y^u \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{|\gamma_u+\delta_u|} & \lambda^{|\gamma_u+\beta_u|} & \lambda^{|\gamma_u|} \\ \lambda^{|\alpha_u+\delta_u|} & \lambda^{|\alpha_u+\beta_u|} & \lambda^{|\alpha_u|} \\ \lambda^{|\delta_u|} & \lambda^{|\beta_u|} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y^d \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{|\gamma_d+\delta_d+n_d|} & \lambda^{|\gamma_d+\beta_d+n_d|} & \lambda^{|\gamma_d+n_d|} \\ \lambda^{|\alpha_d+\delta_d+n_d|} & \lambda^{|\alpha_d+\beta_d+n_d|} & \lambda^{|\alpha_d+n_d|} \\ \lambda^{|\delta_d+n_d|} & \lambda^{|\beta_d+n_d|} & \lambda^{|n_d|} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Y^e \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{|\gamma_e+\delta_e+n_e|} & \lambda^{|\gamma_e+\beta_e+n_e|} & \lambda^{|\gamma_e+n_e|} \\ \lambda^{|\alpha_e+\delta_e+n_e|} & \lambda^{|\alpha_e+\beta_e+n_e|} & \lambda^{|\alpha_e+n_e|} \\ \lambda^{|\delta_e+n_e|} & \lambda^{|\beta_e+n_e|} & \lambda^{|n_e|} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{31}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_u = \alpha_d = q'_2 - q'_3, \quad \alpha_e = l'_2 - l'_3, \\ &\beta_u = u'_2 - u'_3, \quad \beta_d = d'_2 - d'_3, \quad \beta_e = e'_2 - e'_3, \\ &\gamma_u = \gamma_d = -q'_2 - 2q'_3, \quad \gamma_e = -l'_2 - 2l'_3, \\ &\delta_u = -u'_2 - 2u'_3, \quad \delta_d = -d'_2 - 2d'_3, \quad \delta_e = -e'_2 - 2e'_3. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

The above analysis applies quite generally to any theory based on a single pseudo-anomalous $U(1)_X$ gauged family symmetry. However the quark and lepton charges may be constrained by imposing unification constraints on the theory. For example:

- $SU(5)$ unification implies [7] $l_i = d_i$, $q_i = u_i = e_i$ but allows Z arbitrary right-handed neutrino charges n_p.
- $SU(2)_R$ gauge symmetry implies that $Z = 3$ with $n_i = e_i$ and $d_i = u_i$.
- Left-right symmetry is stronger than $SU(2)_R$ and implies $n_i = e_i = l_i$ and $d_i = u_i = q_i$.
- Pati-Salam $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ implies $l_i = q_i$ and $u_i = d_i = e_i = n_i$.
- $SO(10)$ unification implies $l_i = d_i = q_i = u_i = e_i = n_i$
- Trinification $SU(3)^3$ implies $u_i = d_i$, $l_i = e_i = n_i$ and unconstrained q_i
- Flipped $SU(5) \times U(1)$ implies $q_i = d_i = n_i$, $u_i = l_i$ and unconstrained e_i

As discussed in ref.[13] these examples are difficult to reconcile with the data without either appealing to group theoretical Clebsch relations or carefully chosen dynamical assumptions. [8] We shall therefore not impose such gauge unification constraints here but instead consider the general case in Eqs.31.

By comparing Eqs.31, to Eqs.16, 18 suitable choices of the integers $\alpha_a, \beta_a, \gamma_a, \delta_a$, (where $a = u, d, e$) can readily be deduced. Note especially that $m_b/m_\tau \sim 1$ implies

$$n = |n_e| = |n_d|, \quad \tan\beta \sim \lambda^{n-3}. \tag{33}$$

It is straightforward to scan over all the possible positive and negative integers $\alpha_a, \beta_a, \gamma_a, \delta_a, n_a$ to find acceptable Yukawa matrices from Eqs.31. For example a special case is when $\alpha_a, \beta_a, \gamma_a, \delta_a, n_a$ are all positive definite integers [14]. In this case from Eqs.16, 18, 31 we find $\alpha_u = \alpha_d = 2$, $\alpha_e = 0$, $\beta_u = 2$, $\beta_d = 0$, $\beta_e = 2$, $\gamma_u = \gamma_d = 3$,

---

[7] Note that $SU(5)$ automatically guarantees Green-Schwartz anomaly cancellation for any choice of charges.

[8] The $SU(3)^3$ model discussed there looks the most natural.

$\gamma_e = 2$, $\delta_u = 5$, $\delta_d = 1$, $\delta_e = 2$, $n_e = n_d = n$. [9] The Yukawa matrices are then fully specified in this example, up to a $\tan\beta$ dependence:

$$Y^u \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^8 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^7 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^5 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y^d \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^3 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \lambda^n, \quad Y^e \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \lambda^n. \tag{34}$$

Given $\alpha_a, \beta_a, \gamma_a, \delta_a, n_a$ above and using Eqs.29, 30, 32 we find the following traceless:

$$\begin{aligned} &q'_i = \frac{1}{3}(4,1,-5), \quad u'_i = \frac{1}{3}(8,-1,-7), \quad d'_i = \frac{1}{3}(2,-1,-1) \\ &l'_i = \frac{1}{3}(4,-2,-2), \quad e'_i = \frac{1}{3}(2,2,-4), \quad h'_u = 4, \quad h'_d = 2+n \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

The physical (unprimed) charges are by definition those which lead to the Higgs charges satisfying $h_u = -h_d$. Eq.27 shows that there remains an ambiguity in the choice of Higgs charges and hence in $\Delta t, \Delta f$ which are two unknowns constrained by only one relation, namely $-3\Delta t = h'_d + h'_u + \Delta f$. We can regard Δf as being a completely free parameter whose choice specifies all the physical (unprimed) charges uniquely. For example we may set the Higgs charges to be zero by taking [10] $\Delta t = -2$, $\Delta f = -n$ which enables the physical (unprimed) charges to be deduced from Eq.26. Other choices of Δf will lead to different choices of physical charges.

5 SRHND and U(1) Family Symmetry

We now turn our attention to the neutrino sector, which is the main focus of this paper. Since the Z right-handed neutrinos are not constrained by anomaly cancellation it is most convenient to work with physical (unprimed) charges as in Eq.25. Y^ν

---

[9] Note that $n_e = n_d = n$ imposes the non-trivial constraint that $\alpha_e+\beta_e+\gamma_e+\delta_e = \alpha_d+\beta_d+\gamma_d+\delta_d$ which is satisfied here. If for example we had taken $\frac{m_e}{m_\tau} \sim \lambda^5$ it would not be satisfied.

[10] Note that in general both both Δt and Δf are non-zero and so the family symmetry $U(1)_X$ cannot be anomaly-free and is instead pseudo-anomalous [22].

clearly depends on the combination of lepton and Higgs charges

$$l_i + h_u = l'_i + h'_u/3 - 2h'_d/3 - 5\Delta f/3$$

which is not fixed by the primed charges due to the remaining freedom in Δf. In dealing with the neutrino sector it is convenient to absorb the Higgs charge h_u into the definition of the lepton charges l_i so that Eq.25 becomes

$$Y^{\nu}_{ip} \sim \lambda^{|l_i+n_p|}, \quad M^{pq}_{RR} \sim \lambda^{|n_p+n_q+\sigma|} < \Sigma > \tag{36}$$

where the redefined l_i are related to the traceless charges l'_i by arbitrary family-independent shifts, and using Eq.35 may be written as:

$$l_i = (2 + l_3, l_3, l_3) \tag{37}$$

where the numerical value of l_3 remains a free choice.

The light Majorana matrix may then be constructed from Eq.9 which we repeat below

$$m_{LL} = v_2^2 Y_{\nu} M^{-1}_{RR} Y^T_{\nu} \tag{38}$$

If we were to assume positive definite values for $l_i + n_p$ and $n_p + n_q + \sigma$ then the modulus signs could be dropped and the right-handed neutrino charges n_p would cancel when m_{LL} is constructed from Eqs.38 and 36 [26]. The argument relies on the observation that if the modulus signs are dropped from Eq.36 one can always write

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{\nu} &= diag(\lambda^{l_1}, \lambda^{l_2}, \lambda^{l_3}) Y_D diag(\lambda^{n_1}, \ldots, \lambda^{n_Z}), \\ M_{RR} &= diag(\lambda^{n_1}, \ldots, \lambda^{n_Z}) M_M diag(\lambda^{n_1}, \ldots, \lambda^{n_Z}) \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where Y_D and M_M are democratic matrices. Inserting Eq.39 into Eq.9 the right-handed neutrino charges are seen to cancel. Such a cancellation would imply that every right-handed neutrino would contribute equally to every entry in m_{LL} regardless of the right-handed neutrino charges. From the point of view of SRHND it is therefore important that such a cancellation does not take place, and so we shall require that at least some of the combinations $l_i + n_p$ and $n_p + n_q + \sigma$ take negative values. In such a case the choice of right-handed neutrino charges will play an important role in determining m_{LL}, and each particular choice of n_p must be analysed separately.

At first sight the general case of Z right-handed neutrinos with unconstrained charges n_p leading to non-positive definite exponents in Eq.36 seems to make the determination of m_{LL} an intractable problem. However we have already argued that the atmospheric neutrino data suggests SRHND in the 23 sector and this will lead to m_{LL} of the form given in Eq.20. We shall now formulate the general conditions which will lead to SRHND in the 23 sector.

5.1 One Right-handed Neutrino

Let us first consider the case $Z = 1$ where there is just a single right-handed neutrino, which for later convenience we shall refer to as N_3^c with charge n_3. In this case Eq.36 becomes

$$Y_{i3}^{\nu} \sim \lambda^{|l_i+n_3|}, \quad M_{RR}^{33} \sim \lambda^{|2n_3+\sigma|} < \Sigma > . \tag{40}$$

Being a 1×1 matrix M_{RR}^{33} is trivially inverted and we obtain from Eqs.38,

$$m_{LL}^{ij} \sim \lambda^{|l_i+n_3|} \lambda^{|l_j+n_3|} \frac{v_2^2}{M_{RR}^{33}} \tag{41}$$

which should be compared to Eq.2, where we identify [11]

$$Y_{i3}^{\nu} \sim \lambda^{|l_i+n_3|} \sim (\lambda_{\nu_e}, \lambda_{\nu_\mu}, \lambda_{\nu_\tau}) \tag{42}$$

Then Eq.20 requires that

$$|l_2 + n_3| = |l_3 + n_3|, \qquad |l_1 + n_3| - |l_3 + n_3| = 2 \tag{43}$$

---

[11] Even though the couplings in Eq.2 were defined in the diagonal charged lepton basis, the identification is still valid to a consistent order of the expansion parameter.

If both $l_2 + n_3$ and $l_3 + n_3$ have the same sign (SS) then $l_2 = l_3$, whereas if they have opposite signs (OS) then $l_2 + l_3 = -2n_3$. Similarly if both $l_1 + n_3$ and $l_3 + n_3$ have the SS then $l_1 - l_3 = 2$, whereas if they have OS then $l_1 + l_3 = 2 - 2n_3$. Interestingly the SS cases $l_2 = l_3$, $l_1 - l_3 = 2$ have already arisen in the example in Eq.35, which corresponds to l_i charges in Eq.37. This is no surprise since it originates from the charged lepton Yukawa matrix in Eq.18 which follows from the assumption $V_{MNS} \sim V_{\nu L} \sim V_{eL}$ and the Super-Kamiokande data and the MSW solution.

To summarise, from Eqs.40, 41 and imposing Eq.43 the single right-handed neutrino included so far leads to

$$m_{LL} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} m_{\nu_3} \tag{44}$$

where the atmospheric neutrino mass is given

$$m_{\nu_3} \sim \lambda^{2|l_3+n_3|-|2n_3+\sigma|} \frac{v_2^2}{<\Sigma>} \tag{45}$$

With only a single right-handed neutrino m_{LL} in Eq.44 has two zero eigenvalues, and a vanishing determinant of the 23 submatrix, as in Eq.2. In order to implement the small angle MSW solution we need to include the effect of subdominant right-handed neutrinos which break the massless degeneracy. SRHND requires that the elements in the 23 sector of Eq.44 must receive corrections of order λ^2 from the subdominant neutrinos so that the determinant of the 23 submatrix only *approximately* vanishes to this order leading to a small eigenvalue of order λ^2 and the desired mass hierarchy in Eq.19.

5.2 Two Right-handed Neutrinos

We now include a second right-handed neutrino N_2^c with charge n_2, in addition to N_3^c with charge n_3. With two right-handed neutrinos, $Z = 2$, the heavy Majorana mass matrix from Eq.36 is

$$M_{RR} \sim \left(\begin{array}{cc} \lambda^{|2n_2+\sigma|} & \lambda^{|n_2+n_3+\sigma|} \\ \lambda^{|n_2+n_3+\sigma|} & \lambda^{|2n_3+\sigma|} \end{array} \right) < \Sigma > \tag{46}$$

For SRHND we clearly require $n_2 \neq n_3$ to avoid the two right-handed neutrinos contributing democratically. More generally for SRHND we need to avoid large right-handed neutrino mixing angles. If we assume without loss of generality that $\lambda^{|2n_2+\sigma|} > \lambda^{|2n_3+\sigma|}$, so that N_2^c is heavier than N_3^c, then this implies

$$|2n_2 + \sigma| < |2n_3 + \sigma| \tag{47}$$

Then the small mixing angle requirement is

$$|2n_2 + \sigma| < |n_2 + n_3 + \sigma| \tag{48}$$

The lightest eigenvalue is of order the diagonal element provided

$$|2n_2 + \sigma| \leq 2|n_2 + n_3 + \sigma| - |2n_3 + \sigma| \tag{49}$$

Assuming all these conditions are met then M_{RR} will be diagonalised by small angle rotations and have hierarchical eigenvalues set by the diagonal elements. As a first approximation we may drop the off-diagonal elements and write

$$M_{RR} \approx diag(M_{R2}, M_{R3}) \tag{50}$$

where

$$M_{R2} \sim \lambda^{|2n_2+\sigma|} < \Sigma >, \quad M_{R3} \sim \lambda^{|2n_3+\sigma|} < \Sigma > \tag{51}$$

Then the light Majorana matrix is given by adding the separate contribution from each of the two right-handed neutrinos

$$m_{LL}^{ij} = v_2^2 \left(\frac{Y_\nu^{i2} Y_\nu^{j2}}{M_{R2}} + \frac{Y_\nu^{i3} Y_\nu^{j3}}{M_{R3}} \right) \tag{52}$$

It is clear that the dominant contribution to a particular element of m_{LL} will come from the right-handed neutrino which is at the same time the lightest, and couples the most strongly to left-handed neutrinos. Without loss of generality we have taken N_3^c to be the lighter right-handed neutrino and to give the dominant contribution to the 23 block of m_{LL} in Eq.41. We therefore write the subdominant contribution coming from the second right-handed neutrino N_2^c as

$$\delta m_{LL}^{ij} = \lambda^{|l_i+n_2|}\lambda^{|l_j+n_2|}\frac{v_2^2}{M_{R2}} \tag{53}$$

As discussed below Eq.44 we require:

$$\frac{\delta m_{LL}^{33}}{m_{LL}^{33}} = \frac{\lambda^{2|l_3+n_2|}}{\lambda^{2|l_3+n_3|}}\frac{M_{R3}}{M_{R2}} \sim \lambda^2 \tag{54}$$

From Eqs.51,

$$\frac{M_{R3}}{M_{R2}} \sim \lambda^{|2n_3+\sigma|-|2n_2+\sigma|} \tag{55}$$

so Eq.54 implies the condition

$$2|l_3+n_2| - 2|l_3+n_3| + |2n_3+\sigma| - |2n_2+\sigma| = 2 \tag{56}$$

We already observed that the required MSW perturbation is

$$\delta m_{LL}^{33} \sim \frac{v_2^2}{M_U} \tag{57}$$

so we deduce

$$\frac{M_{R2}}{M_U} \sim \lambda^{2|l_3+n_2|}, \quad \frac{<\Sigma>}{M_U} \sim \lambda^{2|l_3+n_2|-|2n_2+\sigma|} \tag{58}$$

There is the further requirement that the powers of λ occuring in M_{RR} and Y_ν be either integer or half-integer. [12] By scanning over half-integer and integer values of l_3, n_2, n_3, σ we find that there are no solutions which satisfy all the above constraints for integer powers of λ in M_{RR} and Y_ν.[13] However there are a large number of solutions involving half-integer powers of λ in M_{RR} and Y_ν (of course m_{LL} in Eq.20 always involves integer powers of λ.) The condition in Eq.56 may be achieved in various ways with N_3^c being lighter than N_2^c by a factor, $M_{R3}/M_{R2} \sim \lambda^{|2n_3+\sigma|-|2n_2+\sigma|} \sim \lambda^a$, and the ratio of the Dirac couplings of N_2^c, N_3^c to L_3 given by $\lambda^{2|l_3+n_2|-2|l_3+n_3|} \sim \lambda^{2-a}$, where $a > 0$ is a positive integer. For example $l_3 = -1/2, n_2 = 0, n_3 = 1, \sigma = 0$ satisfies all the conditions with $a = 2$ and Y_ν involving half-integer exponents. Further examples are listed in Table 1.

---

[12] In the case of half-integer powers this implies that the θ, $\bar\theta$ fields which break the $U(1)_X$ symmetry must have charges ±1/2 and the expansion parameter in Eq.23 must be redefined so that $\frac{<\theta>}{M_V} = \frac{<\bar\theta>}{M_V} = \lambda^{1/2}$, as in ref.[13].

[13] I am grateful to Y. Nir (private communication) for pointing this out.

5.3 Three Right-handed Neutrinos

We now wish to extend the discussion to include three right-handed neutrinos $Z = 3$, by introducing a third right-handed neutrino N_1^c with charge n_1 in addition to the two already introduced above. Again we shall suppose that N_3^c gives the dominant contribution to the 23 sector masses. As for the $Z = 2$ case we require $n_3 \neq n_2, n_1$, and we need to ensure that N_3^c does not have large mixing angles in M_{RR} in order to isolate it from the other right-handed neutrinos. This can be ensured by a sequence of conditions similar to Eqs.47, 48, 49. Then, after small angle rotations, M_{RR} can be written in block diagonal form.

$$M_{RR} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{|2n_1+\sigma|} & \lambda^{|n_1+n_2+\sigma|} & 0 \\ \lambda^{|n_2+n_1+\sigma|} & \lambda^{|2n_2+\sigma|} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda^{|2n_3+\sigma|} \end{pmatrix} < \Sigma > \tag{59}$$

which is the analogue of Eq.50. The new feature of the $Z = 3$ case compared to the $Z = 2$ case is that there are now several possibilities for the structure of the upper 2×2 block in Eq.59 which are all consistent with SRHND, which are listed below.

"Diagonal dominated" corresponding to $|n_1 + n_2 + \sigma| > min(|2n_1 + \sigma|, |2n_2 + \sigma|)$:

$$M_{RR}^{upper} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{|2n_1+\sigma|} & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{|2n_2+\sigma|} \end{pmatrix} < \Sigma > \tag{60}$$

"Off-diagonal dominated" corresponding to $|n_1 + n_2 + \sigma| < |2n_1 + \sigma|, |2n_2 + \sigma|$:

$$M_{RR}^{upper} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda^{|n_1+n_2+\sigma|} \\ \lambda^{|n_2+n_1+\sigma|} & 0 \end{pmatrix} < \Sigma > \tag{61}$$

l_3	n_2	n_3	σ	a
-1	-1/2	0	1	1
-1	0	1/2	0	1
-1	0	1/2	1/2	1
-1	0	1/2	1	1
-1	1/2	1	-1	1
-1	1/2	1	-1/2	1
-1	1/2	1	0	1
-1	1/2	1	1/2	1
-1	1/2	1	1	1
-1/2	-1/2	0	1	1
-1/2	0	1/2	0	1
-1/2	0	1/2	1/2	1
-1/2	0	1/2	1	1
0	-1/2	0	1	1
0	1/2	0	-1	1
1/2	0	-1/2	-1	1
1/2	0	-1/2	-1/2	1
1/2	0	-1/2	0	1
1/2	1/2	0	-1	1
1	-1/2	-1	-1	1
1	-1/2	-1	-1/2	1
1	-1/2	-1	0	1
1	-1/2	-1	1/2	1
1	-1/2	-1	1	1
1	0	-1/2	-1	1
1	0	-1/2	-1/2	1
1	0	-1/2	0	1
1	1/2	0	-1	1
-1/2	0	1	0	2
-1/2	0	1	1/2	2
-1/2	0	1	1	2
0	-1/2	1/2	1	2
0	1/2	-1/2	-1	2
1/2	0	-1	-1	2
1/2	0	-1	-1/2	2
1/2	0	-1	0	2
0	-1/2	1	1	3
0	1/2	-1	-1	3

Table 1: Simple $Z = 2$ examples which satisfy all the conditions of SRHND given in the text.

"Democratic" corresponding to $|n_1 + n_2 + \sigma| = |2n_1 + \sigma| = |2n_2 + \sigma|$:

$$M_{RR}^{upper} \sim \left(\begin{array}{cc} \lambda^{|2n_1+\sigma|} & \lambda^{|n_1+n_2+\sigma|} \\ \lambda^{|n_2+n_1+\sigma|} & \lambda^{|2n_2+\sigma|} \end{array} \right) < \Sigma > \tag{62}$$

In the "diagonal dominated" case after small angle rotations the light effective Majorana mass matrix in Eq.38 may be calculated in the diagonal right-handed neutrino basis

$$m_{LL} = v_2^2 Y_\nu M_{RR}^{-1} Y_\nu^T = v_2^2 Y_\nu \Omega_{RR}^\dagger (M_{RR}^{diag})^{-1} \Omega_{RR} Y_\nu^T \tag{63}$$

The advantage of working in a diagonal right-handed neutrino mass basis is that $(M_{RR}^{diag})^{-1} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{M_{R1}^{-1}}, \mathrm{M_{R2}^{-1}}, \mathrm{M_{R3}^{-1}})$ so if we define $\tilde{Y}_\nu \equiv Y_\nu \Omega_{RR}^\dagger$ as the neutrino Yukawa matrix in the diagonal right-handed neutrino basis, then the effective light mass matrix elements are given from Eq.63 by

$$m_{LL}^{ij} = \sum_{p=1}^{3} v_2^2 \frac{\tilde{Y}_\nu^{ip} \tilde{Y}_\nu^{jp}}{M_{Rp}} \tag{64}$$

In this case Ω_{RR} involves small angle rotations and so $\tilde{Y}_\nu \sim Y_\nu$, and the contributions to m_{LL} from the neutrinos N_1^c, N_2^c are:

$$\delta m_{LL}^{ij} = v_2^2 \left(\frac{Y_\nu^{i1} Y_\nu^{j1}}{M_{R1}} + \frac{Y_\nu^{i2} Y_\nu^{j2}}{M_{R2}} \right) \tag{65}$$

where

$$M_{R1} \sim \lambda^{|2n_1+\sigma|} < \Sigma >, \quad M_{R2} \sim \lambda^{|2n_2+\sigma|} < \Sigma > \tag{66}$$

and from Eq.36 $Y_\nu^{ip} = \lambda^{|l_i+n_p|}$. Similar to Eq.54 in this case we require

$$\frac{\delta m_{LL}^{33}}{m_{LL}^{33}} \sim \frac{\lambda^{2|l_3+n_1|}}{\lambda^{2|l_3+n_3|}} \frac{M_{R3}}{M_{R1}} + \frac{\lambda^{2|l_3+n_2|}}{\lambda^{2|l_3+n_3|}} \frac{M_{R3}}{M_{R2}} \sim \lambda^2 \tag{67}$$

Thus the conditions for the "diagonal dominated case" are:

$$\begin{aligned} & 2|l_3+n_1| - 2|l_3+n_3| + |2n_3+\sigma| - |2n_1+\sigma| \geq 2, \\ & 2|l_3+n_2| - 2|l_3+n_3| + |2n_3+\sigma| - |2n_2+\sigma| \geq 2 \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

where at least one of the inequalities must be saturated.

In the "off-diagonal dominated" case M_{RR} can again be simply inverted leading to

$$\delta m_{LL}^{ij} = v_2^2 \left(\frac{Y_\nu^{i1} Y_\nu^{j2}}{M_{R12}} + \frac{Y_\nu^{i2} Y_\nu^{j1}}{M_{R12}} \right) \tag{69}$$

where

$$M_{R12} \sim \lambda^{|n_1+n_2+\sigma|} < \Sigma > . \tag{70}$$

Again similar to Eq.54 we require

$$\frac{\delta m_{LL}^{33}}{m_{LL}^{33}} \sim \frac{\lambda^{|l_3+n_1|+|l_3+n_2|}}{\lambda^{2|l_3+n_3|}} \frac{M_{R3}}{M_{R12}} \sim \lambda^2 \tag{71}$$

Thus the condition for the "off-diagonal dominated case" is:

$$|l_3+n_1| + |l_3+n_2| - 2|l_3+n_3| + |2n_3+\sigma| - |n_1+n_2+\sigma| = 2. \tag{72}$$

In the "democratic" case M_{RR} can be readily inverted leading to a result of order

$$\delta m_{LL}^{ij} \sim v_2^2 \left(\frac{Y_\nu^{i1} Y_\nu^{j1}}{M} \right) \tag{73}$$

where the right-handed neutrino masses in the upper block, M, are all equal by the democratic assumption and we have specialised to $n_1 = n_2$ which implies from Eq.36 that $Y_\nu^{i1} \sim Y_\nu^{i2}$. Once again similar to Eq.54 we require

$$\frac{\delta m_{LL}^{33}}{m_{LL}^{33}} \sim \frac{\lambda^{2|l_3+n_1|}}{\lambda^{2|l_3+n_3|}} \frac{M_{R3}}{M} \sim \lambda^2 \tag{74}$$

Thus the condition for the "democratic case" is:

$$2|l_3+n_1| - 2|l_3+n_3| + |2n_3+\sigma| - |2n_1+\sigma| = 2. \tag{75}$$

In practice examples of all three kinds can easily be constructed along the same lines as the explicit $Z = 2$ case. The "democratic" case with $n_1 = n_2$ is isomorphic to the $Z = 2$ case. The $Z = 2$ results trivially generalise in this case to $n_p = (n_2, n_2, n_3)$ where some examples of charges were listed in Table 1. For example $l_3 = -1/2, n_p = (0, 0, 1), \sigma = 0$ satisfies all the "democratic" conditions with $a = 2$

and Y_ν involving half-integer exponents. Clearly in the "democratic" case the $Z = 2$ results can immediately be generalised to any number of right-handed neutrinos Z with $n_p = (n_2, \ldots, n_2, n_3)$, where (n_2, n_3) are the $Z = 2$ charges.

The "diagonal dominated" case also follows a similar pattern to the $Z = 2$ case with the lighter of N_1^c, N_2^c playing the role of the subdominant right-handed neutrino in the $Z = 2$ case. It is straightforward to scan over all the half-integer and integer charges which satisfy the "diagonal dominated" conditions and generate a list of charges for this case, analagous to Table 1. A single example will suffice: $l_3 = -3/2, n_p = (0, 1, 2), \sigma = 0$ satisfies all the "diagonal dominated" conditions and Eq.68 is saturated by N_2^c which plays the role of the subdominant right-handed neutrino of the $Z = 2$ case, with N_1^c being both heavier and having more suppressed Dirac couplings. Again the "diagonal dominated" case can immediately be generalised to any number Z of right-handed neutrinos $n_p = (n_q, n_2, n_3)$, where (n_2, n_3) are the $Z = 2$ charges with N_2^c playing the role of the subdominant right-handed neutrino and N_q^c giving subsubdominant contributions to the 23 block of m_{LL}.

Examples of the "off-diagonal dominated" kind have already been proposed in the literature, although they were not interpreted as being due to SRHND [15]. To show that the models in ref.[15] are examples of SRHND of the "off-diagonal dominated" kind it suffices to consider a specific example:

$$l_i = (2, 0, 0), \quad n_p = (1, -1, 0), \quad \sigma = 0 \tag{76}$$

It is immediately clear that the charges in Eq.76 satisfy the conditions for SRHND in general Eq.43 and in particular the "off-diagonal dominated" conditions $|n_1 + n_2 + \sigma| < |2n_1 + \sigma|, |2n_2 + \sigma|$ and Eq.72. This immediately substantiates our claim that these models correspond to SRHND of the "off-diagonal dominated" kind. Note that Y^ν involves integer exponents. In view of the interest in this example in the literature we develop it in a little more detail below.

The charges in Eq.76 lead to the following neutrino Yukawa and heavy Majorana matrices

$$Y^\nu \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^3 & \lambda & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda & \lambda & 1 \\ \lambda & \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_{RR} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^2 & 1 & \lambda \\ 1 & \lambda^2 & \lambda \\ \lambda & \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} < \Sigma > \tag{77}$$

Due to the assumed charges, the heavy Majorana matrix is dominated by three equal mass terms $< \Sigma > N_1^c N_2^c$, $< \Sigma > N_2^c N_1^c$ and $< \Sigma > N_3^c N_3^c$, leading to three roughly degenerate right-handed neutrinos. However of the three right-handed neutrinos it is N_3^c which couples dominantly to the left-handed neutrinos of the second and third family, due to the assumed choice of X charges, and hence dominates the 23 sector of m_{LL}. To see this we evaluate m_{LL} in the basis in which

$$M_{RR} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} < \Sigma >, \quad M_{RR}^{-1} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} < \Sigma >^{-1} \tag{78}$$

In this basis we define $\tilde{Y}_\nu \equiv Y_\nu \Omega_{RR}^\dagger$ where

$$\Omega_{RR} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda^2 & \lambda \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & \lambda \\ \lambda & \lambda & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{79}$$

Evaluating m_{LL} in this basis we find from Eqs.9 and 78

$$m_{LL}^{ij} = \frac{v_2^2}{< \Sigma >} (\tilde{Y}_\nu^{i1} \tilde{Y}_\nu^{j2} + \tilde{Y}_\nu^{i2} \tilde{Y}_\nu^{j1} + \tilde{Y}_\nu^{i3} \tilde{Y}_\nu^{j3}) \tag{80}$$

corresponding to the contributions from the inverse mass terms $< \Sigma > N_1^c N_2^c$, $< \Sigma > N_2^c N_1^c$ and $< \Sigma > N_3^c N_3^c$, respectively. Since $\tilde{Y}_\nu \sim Y_\nu$ with the order one contributions to $\tilde{Y}_\nu$ coming exclusively from N_3^c, it is clear (by explicit evaluation of Eq.80) that N_3^c dominates the contributions to the 23 block of m_{LL}, with corrections of order λ^2 coming from the other contributions. The remaining parts of m_{LL} receive contributions at the same order as the N_3^c contributions coming from N_1^c, N_2^c. Thus the resulting light effective neutrino matrix is as in Eq.20, with SRHND in the 23 sector due to N_3^c dominance with $O(\lambda^2)$ corrections from other right-handed neutrinos.

Finally we note that for $Z > 3$ the above three categories “diagonal dominated”, “off-diagonal dominated” and “democratic” may be combined in all possible ways.

6 Conclusion

We have suggested a natural explanation of both neutrino mass hierarchies *and* large neutrino mixing angles, as required by the atmospheric neutrino data, in terms of a single right-handed neutrino giving the dominant contribution to the 23 block of the light effective neutrino matrix. We illustrated this mechanism in the framework of models with a single pseudo-anomalous $U(1)_X$ family symmetry, expanding all masses and mixing angles in terms of the Wolfenstein parameter λ. Sub-dominant contributions to the 23 sector from other right-handed neutrinos, suppressed by a factor of λ^2, are required to give small mass splittings appropriate to the small angle MSW solution to the solar neutrino problem. We gave general conditions for achieving this in the framework of $U(1)_X$ family symmetry models containing arbitrary numbers of right-handed neutrinos Z. We classified the $Z = 3$ cases into three categories: "diagonal dominated", "off-diagonal dominated" and "democratic", and discussed examples of each kind. Although the approach in [15] is based on the formal condition that the subdeterminant vanishes to order λ^2, we have shown that explicit examples of this kind of model may be classified within our framework as SRHND of the "off-diagonal dominated" kind. Although we discussed a particular family symmetry it is clear that the idea of SRHND is more general and has recently been used in a model with $SU(2)$ family symmetry [16].

References

[1] Y. Fukuda et al., Super-Kamiokande collaboration, Phys. Lett. B433 (1998) 9; Phys. Lett. B436 (1998) 33; Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 1562.

[2] S. Hatakeyama et al., Kamiokande collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett.81 (1998) 2016; M. Ambrosio et al., MACRO collaboration, Phys. Lett. B434 (1998) 451.

[3] K.S. Hirata et al., Kamiokande collaboration, Phys. Lett. B205 (1988) 416, Phys. Lett. B280 (1992) 146; E.W. Beier et al., Phys. Lett. B283 (1992) 446; Y. Fukuda et al., Kamiokande collaboration, Phys. Lett. B335 (1994) 237; K. Munakata et al., Kamiokande collaboration, Phys. Rev. D56 (1997) 23; Y. Oyama et al., Kamiokande collaboration, hep-ex/9706008; D. Casper et al., IMB collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991) 2561; R. Becker-Szendy et al., IMB collaboration, Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 3720; W.W.M. Allison et al., Soudan-2 collaboration, Phys. Lett. B391 (1997) 491.

[4] Y. Fukuda *et al*, Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, `hep-ex/9805021`.
B.T. Cleveland *Nucl. Phys.* **B38** (1995) 47; Gallex Collaboration, *Phys. Lett.* **B388** (1996) 384; Gallex Collaboration, TAUP97, Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso September 1997, to appear on *Nucl. Phys.* **B** (Proc. Suppl.); V. Gavrin *et al* (SAGE Collaboration) *Phys. Lett.* **B328** (1994) 234; SAGE Collaboration, Neutrino 96, Helsinki June 1996 to appear on *Nucl. Phys.* **B** (Proc. Suppl.).

[5] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. **D17** (1978) 2369;
S. Mikheyev and A. Yu. Smirnov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **42** (1985) 913.

[6] V.N. Gribov, B.M. Pontecorvo, *Phys. Lett.* **B 28** (1969) 493.

[7] more recently, see, *e.g.*
V. Barger, K. Whisnant, R.J.N. Phillips, *Phys. Rev.* **D24** (1981) 538; S. L. Glashow, L. M. Krauss, *Phys. Lett.* **190B** (1987) 199; V. Barger, R.J.N. Phillips, K. Whisnant, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 3084, *ibid* **69** (1992) 3135; N.Hata, P.G. Langacker, *Phys. Rev.* **D 56** (1997) 6107; P.I. Krastev, S.T. Petcov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 449** (1995) 605. S. L. Glashow, P. J. Kernan, L. M. Krauss, hep-ph/9808470.

[8] J.N. Bahcall, P.I. Krastev and A.Y. Smirnov, *Phys. Rev.* **D58** (1998) 096016; and references therein.

[9] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky in Sanibel Talk, CALT-68-709, Feb 1979, and in *Supergravity* (North Holland, Amsterdam 1979); T. Yanagida in *Proc. of the Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon Number of the Universe*, KEK, Japan, 1979.

[10] I. Sogami et al, hep-ph/9807449; K. Akama and K. Katsuura, hep-ph/9807534; M. Drees *et al*, Phys. Rev. **D57** (1998) 5335; A. Joshipura and A. Smirnov, Phys. Lett. B439 (1998) 103; V. Barger, S.Pakvasa, T.J. Weiler and K. Whisnant, Phys. Lett. B437 (1998) 107; R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall, D. Smith, A. Strumia and N. Weiner, hep-ph/9807235; G. Lazarides and N. Vlachos, Phys. Lett. B441 (1998) 46; M. Tanimoto, Phys. Rev. D59 (1999) 017304; M. Gonzalez-Garcia, H. Nunokawa, O.L.G. Perez and J.W.F. Valle, hep-ph/9807305; M. Jezabek and Y. Sumino, Phys. Lett. B440 (1998) 327; J. Pati, hep-ph/9807315; V. Barger, T. Weiler and K. Whisnant, Phys. Lett. B440 (1998) 1; E. Ma, Phys. Lett. B442 (1998) 238; S. M. Bilenky, C. Giunti and W. Grimus, hep-ph/9812360; G.L. Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone and G. Scioscia, Phys. Rev. D59 (1999) 033001; R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall and A. Strumia, hep-ph/9808333; H. Fritzsch, Z. Xing, hep-ph/9807234; S.M. Bilenky, C. Giunti, hep-ph/9802201; M. Tanimoto, hep-ph/9807517; R. Mohapatra and S. Nussinov, hep-ph/9808301. M. Fukugita, M. Taminoto and T. Yanagida, hep-ph/9809554; W. Buchmuller and T. Yanagida, hep-ph/9810308; Y. Grossman, Y. Nir, Y. Shadmi, JHEP 9810 (1998) 007; C.D. Froggatt, M. Gibson and H.B. Nielsen, hep-ph/9811265; Z. Berezhiani and A. Rossi, hep-ph/9811447; C. Wetterich, hep-ph/9812426. S. Lola and J. Vergados, Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics 40 (1998) 71; V. Barger, S. Pakvasa, T. Weiler and K. Whisnant, hep-ph/9806387; A. Baltz, A.S. Goldhaber, M. Goldhaber, hep-ph/9806540; M. Jezabek and Y. Sumino, hep-ph/9807310; Y. Nomura and T. Yanagida, hep-ph/9807325; H. Georgi and S. Glashow, hep-ph/9808293; K.S. Babu, J.C. Pati and F. Wilczek, hep-ph/9812538; F. Wilczek, hep-ph/9812538;

R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall, G.L. Kane and G.G. Ross, hep-ph/9901228; B.C. Allanach, hep-ph/9806294; Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, hep-ph/9811282; V. Barger et al., Phys. Rev. D58 (1998) 093016; M. Bando and K. Yoshioka, hep-ph/9806400; C.H. Albright and S.M. Barr, Phys. Rev. D58 (1998) 013002; hep-ph/9901318; C.H. Albright, K.S. Babu and S.M. Barr, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 1167; J. Ellis, G. Leontaris, S. Lola and D.V. Nanopoulos, hep-ph/9808251.

[11] S. F. King, Phys. Lett. **B439** (1998) 350, hep-ph/9806440.

[12] S. Davidson and S. F. King, Phys. Lett. **B445** (1998) 191, hep-ph/9808296.

[13] S. Lola and G.Ross, hep-ph/9902283; G. Leontaris, S. Lola and G . Ross, Nucl. Phys. **B454** (1995) 25; H. Dreiner, G. Leontaris, S. Lola G. Ross and C. Scheich, Nucl. Phys. **B436** (1995) 461.

[14] J. Elwood, N. Irges and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 5064, hep-ph/9807228; N. Irges, S. Lavignac and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. **D58** (1998) 035003, hep-ph/9802334.

[15] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, hep-ph/9807353, G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, hep-ph/9809596, G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, hep-ph/9812475.

[16] R. Barbieri, P. Creminelli and A. Romanino, hep-ph/9903460.

[17] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, Prog. Theo. Phys. **28** (1962) 247.

[18] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett **51** (1983) 1945.

[19] M. Apollonio *et al* hep-ex/9711002.

[20] C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nilsen, Nucl. Phys. B147 (1979) 277.

[21] H. Fritzsch, Phys. Lett. 70B (1977) 436; B73 (1978) 317; Nucl. Phys. B155 (1979) 189; J. Harvey, P. Ramond and D. Reiss, Phys. Lett. B92 (1980) 309;

S. Dimopoulos, L. J. Hall and S. Raby, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68 (1992) 1984; C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B261 (1985) 461; P. Kaus and S. Meshkov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A3 (1988) 1251.

[22] L. Ibanez and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B332 (1994) 100.

[23] V. Jain and R. Shrock, Phys. Lett. B352 (1995) 83, hep-ph/9412367.

[24] P. Binetruy and P. Ramond, Phys. Lett. B350 (1995) 49, hep-ph/9412385.

[25] M. Green and J. Schwartz, Phys. Lett. B149 (1984) 117.

[26] A. Rasin and J. P. Silva, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 20, hep-ph/9309240; P. Ramond, hep-ph/9809401.